

Remarks

Claims 1-15 and 17-32 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1-4, 6, 15, 17, 22, 23, 28, and 30 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The claims no longer recited "and/or". Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,636,875 to Bashant in view of U.S. patent 5,506,984 to Miller. The Examiner rejected claims 2-6, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashant in view of Miller and further in view of Zhu. The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashant in view of Miller and further in view of DeVos et al. The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashant in view of Miller and further in view of U.S. patent 6,564,201 to Hamsa. The Examiner rejected claims 17-23 and 27-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashant in view of Miller and Zhu. The Examiner rejected claims 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashant in view of Miller and Zhu and further in view of DeVos et al.

The combination of Bashant, and Miller does not suggest the invention recited in

independent claims 1 or 15 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register. Bashant only suggests adding data of known types of object, such as claims, billing, and web sales. Additionally, Bashant relates to synchronizing related data storage elements in disparate storage systems. The same data is replicated among the storage systems, as described at col. 1, lines 17-29.

On the other hand, Miller only suggests a system for determining whether data is stored in particular databases. Miller suggests that rather than sending separate queries to multiple data bases, a query may be sent to a single "engine" or "broker" that will send the data requests to various databases to determine where data is stored and then retrieve the data when it is located, as described at col. 3, line 65, through col. 4, line 23.. Such a data retrieval system does not suggest replicating data related to the new object from the new object to other systems and relevant systems.

Also, simply sending out data queries to data bases does not suggest establishing a consistency of accessed or retrieved data in the relevant systems by mapping the new object using the virtual asset register. Furthermore, Miller does not suggest checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing a virtual asset register by identifying at least one of the new or a given object or copies of the new or a given object and comparing attributes

of all copies of the same new or given object. Still further, the data retrieval method and system suggested by Miller does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register. The "engine" or "broker" does not suggest providing different systems with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active. Rather, the "engine" or "broker" is accessed to provide data searching and retrieval.

In view of the above, the combination of Bashant, and Miller does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 7, and 12-15.

The combination of Bashant, Miller and Zhu does not suggest the invention recited in claims 2-6, 9 and 10 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register, replicating data related to the new object from the new object to other systems and relevant systems, establishing a consistency of accessed or retrieved data in the relevant systems by mapping the new object using the virtual asset register or checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing a virtual asset

register by identifying at least one of the new or a given object or copies of the new or a given object and comparing attributes of all copies of the same new or given object. Zhu appears to suggest web-based communication among elements of a power system. Zhu suggests that "legacy" systems will simply operate as before. Zhu does not suggest any of the aspects of the invention not suggested by Bashant and Miller, such as a context sensitive interface.

Accordingly, the combination of Bashant, Miller and Zhu does not suggest the invention recited in claims 2-6, 9 and 10.

The combination of Bashant, Miller and DeVos et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 8 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register, replicating data related to the new object from the new object to other systems and relevant systems, establishing a consistency of accessed or retrieved data in the relevant systems by mapping the new object using the virtual asset register or checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing a virtual asset register by identifying at least one of the new or a given object or copies of the new or a given object and comparing attributes of all copies of the same new or given object. The Examiner only cites DeVos et al. as suggesting using a common information model with a resource description framework and a uniform resource identifier compatible with as an identifier with a

standard for the resource description framework. These elements do not suggest the other aspects of the claimed invention not suggested by Bashant and Miller. Accordingly, the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the combination of Bashant, Miller and DeVos et al. and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Bashant, Miller and Hamsa does not suggest the invention recited in claim 11 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register, replicating data related to the new object from the new object to other systems and relevant systems, establishing a consistency of accessed or retrieved data in the relevant systems by mapping the new object using the virtual asset register or checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing a virtual asset register by identifying at least one of the new or a given object or copies of the new or a given object and comparing attributes of all copies of the same new or given object. The Examiner only cites Hamsa as suggesting object integration based on a template, which does not suggest the other aspects of the claimed invention not suggested by Bashant and Miller. Accordingly, the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the combination of Bashant, Miller and Hamsa and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Miller and Zhu does not suggest the invention recited in claims 17-23

and 27-32 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register, replicating data related to the new object from the new object to other systems and relevant systems, establishing a consistency of accessed or retrieved data in the relevant systems by mapping the new object using the virtual asset register or checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing a virtual asset register by identifying at least one of the new or a given object or copies of the new or a given object and comparing attributes of all copies of the same new or given object. The shortcomings of both Miller and Zhu are discussed above. Since both Miller and Zhu do not suggest elements of the claimed invention, the combination of Miller and Zhu does not suggest the invention recited in claims 17-23 and 27-32. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Bashant, Miller, Zhu and DeVos et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 24-26 since, among other things, providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register, replicating data related to the new object from the new object to other systems and

relevant systems, establishing a consistency of accessed or retrieved data in the relevant systems by mapping the new object using the virtual asset register or checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing a virtual asset register by identifying at least one of the new or a given object or copies of the new or a given object and comparing attributes of all copies of the same new or given object. The shortcomings of all of these references are discussed above. Since both these references fail to suggest major elements of the claimed invention, the combination of Miller and Zhu does not suggest the invention recited in claims 24-26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action do not suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this case, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit

overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 27, 2010

/Eric J. Franklin/  
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134  
Attorney for Applicants  
Venable LLP  
575 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: 202-344-4936  
Facsimile: 202-344-8300